

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated June 25, 2010 in which the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As indicated above, claim 10 has been amended to be directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner approves the correction and withdraws the rejection to claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 9-11 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *David, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0131764) in view of *Um, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,536,087).

David, et al. appears to disclose a recorder including a first generator for generating first material identifiers for identifying respective pieces of material on the medium such that each piece is differentiated from other pieces on the medium, and a second generator for generating second, universally unique, identifiers for pieces of material, the second identifiers being generated in respect of one or more of the first identifiers [0010]. The first identifiers, which need to distinguish the pieces of material on the medium, but need not be universally unique, and thus be smaller than universally unique identifiers [0012]. A camcorder 500 records video and audio material on a recording medium. A database processor 176 stores metadata which relates to the material recorded on the tape 126 [0090]. The metadata is linked to the material by UMIDs and by at least MURNs. The MURNs are intended to uniquely identify each piece of material on the tape [0091]. MURNs are generated as the material is recorded on the tape [0093].

Thus, *David, et al.* merely discloses a first generator generating first material identifiers for identifying respective pieces of material on a medium. Nothing in *David, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests associating a first identifier, that can identify data in any storage area, with directory path and file name information about the data as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11. Rather, *David, et al.* only discloses generating a first material identifier for identifying respective pieces of material on a medium.

Um, et al. appears to disclose a formatter which conducts resizing and management information creating operation for still-picture video and audio data. The formatter 17 selects the encoded data to segment or group the selected data to yield successive data units, adds necessary head information to each data unit and transmits them sequentially to an encoding DSP 18. The formatter 17 also produces management information for searching for and controlling reproduction of the re-sized motion picture video and/or audio data (column 4, lines 1-17).

Thus, *Um, et al.* merely discloses a formatter 17 which formats still-picture video and audio data converted from motion picture data. Nothing in *Um, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests associating a first identifier, that can identify data in any storage area, with directory path and file name information about the data as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11. Rather, *Um, et al.* only discloses resizing still-picture video and audio data and creating management information for motion picture data.

A combination of *David, et al.* and *Um, et al.* would merely suggest a first generator for generating first material identifiers for identifying respective pieces of material on a medium as taught by *David, et al.* and to conduct resizing and management information creating operation for still-picture video and audio data that are converted from motion picture data as taught by *Um, et al.* Thus, nothing in the combination of the references shows, teaches or suggests

associating a first identifier, that can identify the data in any storage area, with directory path and file name information about the data as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 would not have been obvious over *David, et al.* and *Um, et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner enters this Amendment for purposes of appeal.

CONCLUSION


If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
Tel. (202) 292-1530

Date: August 23, 2010